



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/616,910	07/14/2000	Tony Moutaux	Q59816	7028

7590 09/29/2004
Sughrue Mion Zinn
MacPeak & Seas PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

BROWN, VERNAL U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2635

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/616,910

Applicant(s)

MOUTAUX ET AL.

Examiner

Vernal U Brown

Art Unit

2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communication filed July 7, 2004.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has acknowledged the amendment of claim 9 and the addition of claims 11-12.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 7, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument concerning sending an interface to the remote control in response to a trigger signal, Goldstein teaches sending an interface to a remote controller from the controller (6) (col. 12 lines 23-34). The sending of an interface to a remote control requires a means for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control and the reference of Borgstahl et al. is relied upon for teaching initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control using a trigger signal (col. 16 lines 41-43).

Regarding applicant's argument concerning the controller detecting amendment to the remote control, Goldstein teaches the motivation for providing menu to the remote control is to overcome the limitation of having dedicated buttons that makes it impossible to update the remote control (col. 2 lines 41-51). The examiner considers the transmitting of the codes and icons to the remote control (col. 12 lines 24-31) as amendments which is use to update the function keys of the remote control.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldstein U.S Patent 5410326 in view of Borgstahl et al. U.S Patent 5909183.

Regarding claims 1-2, Goldstein teaches a telecommunication system (figure 1) comprising a controller (6) to be coupled to a network and comprising a controller-generator for generating at least one device-signal destined for at least one device (col. 17 lines 51-54), a first device (9) coupled to the controller (figure 14) and comprising a first device-receiver for receiving at least one device-signal (col. 9 lines 2-14), a second device (7) coupled to said controller (figure 14) and comprising a second device receiver for receiving at least one device-signal (col. 9 lines 38-45), a remote control unit (5) for sending control signal for controlling the devices (col. 7 lines 5-7). Goldstein also teaches sending an interface to a remote controller from the controller (6) (col. 12 lines 23-34) but is however silent on what initiates the transfer of the interface, therefore the reference of Borgstahl et al. is relied upon for suggesting the use of a trigger signal to initiate the transfer of the interface to the remote control. Borgstahl et al. in an art related remote control system teaches sending an interface to a remote control in response to a trigger signal for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control (col. 16 lines 41-43).

Art Unit: 2635

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the controller to send an interface in response to a trigger-signal to the remote control in Goldstein as evidenced by Borgstahl et al. because Goldstein suggests Goldstein suggests sending an interface to a remote control from the controller and Borgstahl et al. teaches sending an interface to a remote control in response to a trigger signal for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control

Regarding claims 4, 8, 11, and 12, Goldstein teaches the remote control device having an identification and only remote control with an identification number is able to communicate with the (cable converter) controller (col. 4 lines 59-65) and each remote has its unique identification (col. 5 lines 1-5) but is however silent on what initiates the transfer of the interface, therefore the reference of Borgstahl et al. is relied upon for suggesting the use of a trigger signal to initiate the transfer of the interface to the remote control. Borgstahl et al. in an art related remote control system teaches sending an interface to a remote control in response to a trigger signal for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control (col. 16 lines 41-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the controller to send an interface in response to a trigger-signal to the remote control in Goldstein as evidenced by Borgstahl et al. because Goldstein suggests Goldstein suggests sending an interface to a remote control from the controller and Borgstahl et al. teaches sending an interface to a remote control in response to a trigger signal for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control

Art Unit: 2635

Regarding claim 5, Goldstein teaches the control unit (cable converter) transmitting amendments in the form of operating system, infrared codes, and advertising messages over the bi-directional bus to the remote unit (col. 12 lines 23-27). The Controller therefore inherently has a means of detecting such amendment in order to know when to transmit such information to the remote control.

Regarding claim 6, Goldstein teaches the various interface is received by the remote control and stored in a RAM (col. 12 lines 45-47). The remote control received upgrade information from the cable converter (col. 18 lines 15-22) therefore memory storing the original information is overwritten on the receipt of new programming information by the remote control.

Regarding claim 7, Goldstein teaches a controller (6) coupled to a network and for use in a telecommunication system (figure 14) comprising a controller generator for generating signals destined for the devices (col. 17 lines 51-54), devices receiving signal from the controller (col. 9 lines 2-14), remote control unit (5) sending control signal to the devices (col. 7 lines 5-7). Goldstein also teaches the remote control receiving control information from a controller and storing the code in memory (col. 12 lines 25-33) but is however silent on what initiates the transfer of the interface, therefore the reference of Borgstahl et al. is relied upon for suggesting the use of a trigger signal to initiate the transfer of the interface to the remote control. Borgstahl et al. in an art related remote control system teaches sending an interface to a remote control in response to a trigger signal for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control (col. 16 lines 41-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the controller to send an interface in response to a trigger-signal to the remote control in Goldstein as

Art Unit: 2635

evidenced by Borgstahl et al. because Goldstein suggests Goldstein suggests sending an interface to a remote control from the controller and Borgstahl et al. teaches sending an interface to a remote control in response to a trigger signal for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control

Regarding claim 9, Goldstein teaches a telecommunication system comprising a controller (6) to be coupled to a network and comprising a controller-generator for generating at least one device-signal destined for at least one device (col. 17 lines 51-54), a first device (9) coupled to said controller and comprising a first device-receiver for receiving at least one device-signal (col. 9 lines 2-14), a second device (7) coupled to said controller and comprising a second device receiver for receiving at least one device-signal (col. 9 lines 38-45), a remote control unit (5) for sending control signal for controlling the devices (col. 7 lines 5-7). Goldstein also teaches the remote control receiving control information from a controller and storing the code in memory (col. 12 lines 25-33) but is however silent on what initiates the transfer of the interface, therefore the reference of Borgstahl et al. is relied upon for suggesting the use of a trigger signal to initiate the transfer of the interface to the remote control. Borgstahl et al. in an art related remote control system teaches sending an interface to a remote control in response to a trigger signal for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control (col. 16 lines 41-43).

Art Unit: 2635

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the controller to send an interface in response to a trigger-signal to the remote control in Goldstein as evidenced by Borgstahl et al. because Goldstein suggests Goldstein suggests sending an interface to a remote control from the controller and Borgstahl et al. teaches sending an interface to a remote control in response to a trigger signal for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control

Regarding claim 10, Goldstein teaches a telecommunication system (figure 1) comprising a controller (6) to be coupled to a network and comprising a controller-generator for generating at least one device-signal destined for at least one device (col. 17 lines 51-54), a first device (9) coupled to the controller and comprising a first device-receiver for receiving at least one device-signal (col. 9 lines 2-14), a second device (7) coupled to said controller and comprising a second device receiver for receiving at least one device-signal ((col. 9 lines 38-45)), a remote control unit (5) for sending control signal for controlling the devices (col. 7 lines 5-7). Goldstein also teaches the remote control receiving control information from a controller and storing the code in memory (col. 12 lines 25-33) but is however silent on what initiates the transfer of the interface, therefore the reference of Borgstahl et al. is relied upon for suggesting the use of a trigger signal to initiate the transfer of the interface to the remote control. Borgstahl et al. in an art related remote control system teaches sending an interface to a remote control in response to a trigger signal for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control (col. 16 lines 41-43).

Art Unit: 2635

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the controller to send an interface in response to a trigger-signal to the remote control in Goldstein as evidenced by Borgstahl et al. because Goldstein suggests Goldstein suggests sending an interface to a remote control from the controller and Borgstahl et al. teaches sending an interface to a remote control in response to a trigger signal for initiating the transfer of the interface to the remote control

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 3, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest the trigger signal comprises a user identification code.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2635

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vernal U Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:30 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Vernal Brown
September 22, 2004

MICHAEL HORABIK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

